REMARKS

Claims 18-34 remain pending after amendment.

Specification Amendments

Page 6 of the specification is amended to more clearly describe features of the drawings.

Claim Amendments

Claim 1 is amended to more clearly define the claimed invention. The dependent claims are amended accordingly. No new matter is added by these amendments.

Withdrawn Drawing Objection

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the withdrawal of the previous objection to the drawings.

Objection to Claim 1

Claim 1 stands objected to for the reason that the Examiner believes it to be unclear whether the claimed structures are intended to be "in combination". In response, the claims are amended to make reference to "an apparatus". The objection is thus believed to be moot and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 18, 23 and 24 under 35 USC 102(b)

Claims 18, 23 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Van Berkel '371. This rejection respectfully is traversed.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner takes the position that the reference teaches "a first direction can include one in which the work piece is beginning to touch the cutting tool, and a second direction can include one in which additional movement toward the cutting occurs after several slices of the work piece have been cut." The Examiner also takes the position that the backing block and rotary element are separate components, and thus can be considered "reasonably slidable".

In response, claim 18 is amended in a manner which is believed to clearly distinguish over the cited prior art. More specifically, claim 18 is amended to require that the "cutting tool" is a "router" consistent with applicant's disclosure. Van Berkel fails to teach or suggest the use of a router as the cutting tool.

Claim 18 is further amended to state that the backing block and an adjacent area of the fence define confining walls adapted to contact the stock to be cut by the router, with the confining wall of the supporting block being of an area sufficient to hinder unintended movement of the stock caused by rotation of the router.

As noted above, the Examiner takes the position that the second direction in unamended claim 18 could cover the additional movement of Van Berkel's base after several slices of stock have been cut from it. Claim 18 as now amended clearly distinguishes the movement of applicant's base from that of Van Berkel. Van Berkel's direction of cut is

normal to the direction of movement of the base. By contrast, applicant's direction of movement is in the ***same direction***.

Further, the length of further movement in the same direction by the stock has nothing to do with the length of the cut in the stock in Van Berkel. By contrast, such further movement of the stock in the applicant's apparatus causes the cut to lengthen correspondingly. The claimed invention is thus not anticipated by the reference.

In view of the above, the rejection is believed to be without basis, and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 18-20, 23-25, 29 and 34 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 18-20, 23-25, 29 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denman '019 in view of Hedgpeth. This rejection respectfully is traversed.

By way of review, the guide of the present invention makes it possible to alter the direction of movement of a piece of work through a power tool such as a router. The direction of such movement is adjusted by altering the angle of the fence on the working surface. To alter the angle, knobs 16 are loosened so that the angle of fence 11 in grooves 12a,b can be altered. Alteration of the angle of the fence produces a like alteration in the direction of travel of applicant's guide since applicant's guide is slidably and rotatably connected to guide rod 20 which, in turn, is connected to the fence.

The Examiner now takes the position that the claimed invention is unpatentable over the combination of Denman and Hedgpeth.

Concerning the Examiner's rejection of the claims on the basis of the combination of Denman and Hedgpeth, it is submitted that the recognition of such a combination would be only with the benefit of hindsight from applicant's disclosure. Specifically, neither patent teaches or suggests the following aspects of the claimed invention:

- Neither reference teaches or suggests the presence of a mitre gauge attached to a fence. Hedgpeth's mitre gauge is, by contrast, attached to a bar which slides in a groove in the table top. There is no suggestion in Hedgpeth that the mitre gauge can be attached in any other way to a table top.
- Denman uses backing plate 42 solely to advance a work piece through a saw, and not to control the angle of the work piece. Indeed, Denman is directed to an entirely different object, namely to protect the operator of a table saw from injury as he feeds a work piece through a saw. The reference is not concerned about how the angle of a work piece can be altered and describes no method for doing so. Specifically, the reference does not suggest that the attachment of a mitre gauge to the backing plate permits the angle of a work piece to be altered.
- Neither reference teaches or suggests the use of a backing block which, together with a fence, hinders unintended movement of a work piece caused by rotation of a router. As a router rotates it causes a work piece to rotate in the same direction. As the work piece rotates, it pulls away from an operator unless the work piece is firmly clamped to the backing block, If it is not, the work piece may separate from the block by the action of the router and may

strike the operator as it is propelled away from the router. This hazard is obviated by the fence and backing plate 48a of the subject invention. The reason that these two components do so is that routers conventionally rotate counterclockwise and, in so doing, urge a work piece to rotate in like manner. With reference to Figure 2 of the subject application, as the work piece rotates it will strike the fence 11a and backing block 48a. These two components cooperate to prevent the work piece from rotating any further. The fence and block accordingly serve to confine the work piece in the corner space between the two.

The problem of an out-of-control work piece is peculiar to a router, and since neither Hedgpeth nor Denman is directed to routers, neither reference appreciates, discusses or provides any solution to the problem. Denman's backing plate 42 is shown as a narrow plate in the drawings. See for example Figures 1, 2, 4 and 7. Note also Denman's description of the backing plate as a "plate" throughout the patent. Such a description infers that the component is thin. Such a thin component would be ineffective to confine a work piece in the space between it and the fence and to prevent the work piece from being rotated by a router.

In order to better describe the foregoing feature of applicant's apparatus in the main claim 18, the following limitation has been added to claim 18:

> " said backing block and an adjacent area of said fence defining confining walls adapted to contact said stock as said stock is cut by said router, said confining walls of said supporting block being of an area sufficient to hinder unintended movement of said stock caused by rotation of said router".

For the foregoing reasons it is submitted that the combination of Denman and Hedgpeth does not result in applicant's apparatus as now claimed in amended claim 18. The rejection should accordingly be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 21, 22 and 26 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 21, 22 and 26 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denman in view of Hedgpeth, Fontaine and Yerk. This rejection respectfully is traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

The deficiencies of Denman and Hedgpeth are discussed above. Insofar as the rejected claims depend from claim 18, and claim 18 has been shown to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art, this rejection is also without basis and should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 27, 28 and 30-32 under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 27, 28 and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denman in view of Hedgpeth and Fontaine. This rejection respectfully is traversed to the extent deemed to apply to the claims as amended.

The deficiencies of Denman and Hedgpeth are discussed above. Insofar as the rejected claims depend from claim 18, and claim 18 has been shown to patentably distinguish over the cited prior art, this rejection is also without basis and should be withdrawn.

In view of the above, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early indication of same is earnestly solicited.

A check in the amount of $60.00 is attached for payment for the requested one month extension of time.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By _____
James W. Hellwege #28,808

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

JWH/kj
3918-0156P